

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

)
LAETITIA ABY,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) CIVIL ACTION
) NO. 14-13256-DPW
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)
)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER
March 27, 2015

For the reasons set forth below, the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and this action is dismissed.

I. Background

Laetitia Aby brings this action in which she alleges that she has been the subject of "Covert Black Operations: Political and Criminal Targeting and Electronic Harassment," Compl. at 1, officials of the City of Cambridge, her landlord David Serino, and two persons whom she identifies as "hackers." According to Aby, in early 2011 she began to experience severe headaches. She sought medical treatment, but none of the exams and tests (including x-rays, MRIs and CT-scans) revealed the cause of her headaches. The plaintiff further alleges that she began to feel "burning and heating radiation like sensations on [her] skin directed at various areas of [her] body." *Id.* Aby states that, after speaking with military veterans and conducting research "existential evidence of directed weapons, or crowd control weapons," she realized that her phone and internet had been hijacked and that she had been "the subject of deliberate,

deceptive electronic, social and behavioral abuse and violations." *Id.*

She brings this lawsuit "against the culprits [she] believe[s] were the main players in this whole saga." *Id.* She believes that they defendants have "coordinated a very sinister and abusive campaign of harassment and medical record falsifications." *Id.* at 2.

II. Discussion

A. Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*

Upon review of the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, I conclude that she is without income or assets to pay the \$400.00 filing fee. The motion is therefore granted.

B. Screening of the Action

When a plaintiff seeks to file a complaint without prepayment of the filing fee, summonses do not issue until the Court reviews the complaint and determines that it satisfies the substantive requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. This statute authorizes federal courts to dismiss a complaint *sua sponte* if the claims therein are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seek monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). In conducting this review, I liberally construes the complaint because the plaintiff is proceeding pro se. See *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972).

Upon review of the complaint, I conclude that the pleading

falls short of the threshold established by the screening statute. A court may dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) where the allegations in the complaint are "fanciful" or "fantastic," *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (quoting *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325, 328 (1989)), descriptors which apply to the present action.

ORDER

Accordingly:

1. The motion (#2) for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is GRANTED.
2. This motion for appointment of counsel (#3) is DENIED.
3. This action is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Douglas P. Woodlock
DOUGLAS P. WOODLOCK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE